

Remarks

Claims 1 – 45 are pending. Claims 1 – 45 are presently rejected. Claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 have been amended. Claims 42 – 45 have been cancelled. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1 – 32, and 40 – 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0119581 (“Cannon”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of Cannon. However, Applicant amends claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 in an effort to advance the prosecution of the present Application.

Claims 1, 14, and 21, as amended, are directed to a gaming system that includes a plurality of gaming machines. Each of the gaming machines includes first and second displays, and is linked to a remote display. After triggering a feature game, a first image content is displayed on the second display, and a different second image content is also displayed on the remote display. The first image content cooperates with at least certain of the different second image content on the remote display. Thus, the contents as shown in the second display and in the remote display are different. The different contents cooperate to communicate an outcome of a feature game.

Cannon does not anticipate claims 1, 14, and 21.

Rather, Cannon discloses displaying an image on display 162 and essentially the same image on monitor 236. The contents of the images as displayed in display 162 and monitor 236 are the same, regardless of the size of the images displayed. For example, Cannon explicitly discloses that “[d]isplaying the bonus game on bonus display device 236 may allow non-participating casino patrons to view the game and become involved in the excitement.” That is, the content or the game field 430 as displayed on display 162 is also shown on both display 162

and monitor 236. That is, Cannon does not disclose “causing feature images having first image content occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images having first image content occurring on the remote display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game,” among other things. Cannon simply enlarges the second display’s content and displays the same content on the remote display.

Therefore, Cannon does not anticipate independent claims 1, 14 and 21.

Claims 2 – 13, claims 15 – 20, and claims 22 – 39 depend from claims 1, 14, and 21, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 – 13, 15 – 20, and 22 – 39 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cannon would not render claims 1 – 39 obvious as further discussed below.

Claim 40, as amended, is similarly directed to a gaming system that includes a plurality of gaming machines. Each of the gaming machines includes first and second local displays, and is linked to a remote display. At the trigger of a feature game, a player is provided with a plurality of selections on the base game on the first display. After the selection, the first display displays a sequence of images that represents an outcome of the feature game. At least a portion of the sequence is duplicated on the remote display, while the second display displays an enlarged representation of at least a portion of the sequence displayed on the first display.

Cannon does not anticipate claim 40.

To the contrary, Cannon discloses only selecting a marker for the gaming machine in the bonus game on the second display. Nor does Cannon disclose having any selection in the base game, not to mention providing a player with a plurality of choices for selection in the base game.

Further, the Examiner indicates on page 7 of the Action that “a gaming machine system which includes a plurality of gaming machines including a first display and a second display and includes a remote display common to the plurality of gaming machines (fig. 4, par 46).” Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner incorrectly equates the claimed second display to the remote display as disclosed in paragraph [0046] of Cannon. The second display, as claimed, is a clearly part of the local gaming machine, or a local display, and not a remote display.

Therefore, Cannon does not anticipate independent claim 40. Claim 41 depends from claim 40, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reason set forth above with respect to claim 40.

Claims 42 – 45 have been cancelled. The rejection is thus deemed moot.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 33 – 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above with respect to claim 21, from which claims 33 – 39 depend, Cannon does not teach or suggest “causing feature images having first image content occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images having first image content occurring on the remote display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game,” among other things. The contents are different and yet cooperate to represent an outcome. Cannon contradictorily discloses the same content being displayed on the second display and the monitor, and for that reason, claims 33 – 39 are not obvious in view of Cannon.

Therefore, claims 33 – 39 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21.

Similarly, as discussed above with respect to claim 40, Cannon does not teach or suggest “images are caused to be displayed on the base game representing a plurality of choices available to a player in the feature game, ... and following selection of one of the plurality of choices, a sequence of images is displayed on the first display that represent the result of the selection made using the selector,” among other things.

Cannon’s base game does not allow selection of markers. Nor is it obvious to change the base game to display choices.

Therefore, claims 40 and 41 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 42 – 45 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection is deemed moot.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 20, 2010

By: /Larry M. Jarvis/
Larry M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone: (312) 775-8000
Fax: (312) 775-8100